



# **Air Force Contracting Information Systems *System Program Office* *Wright-Patterson AFB, OH* *Integrity@SPS***

**15 Jan 02**

**Joseph J. Matis III**

**Joseph.Matis@wpafb.af.mil**

**DSN: 674-0353**

**URL: [afcis.ssg.gunter.af.mil](http://afcis.ssg.gunter.af.mil)**



# Overview

- **Points of Contact**
- **Integrity@SPS Change Process**
- **Requirements vs. “Bugs”**
- **External Requirements**
- **Functional Review Board (FRB) Role**
- **Current Requirements**
- **Conclusion**



# Points of Contact

## Points of Contact

Integrity@SPS  
Change Process

Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"

External  
Requirements

Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role

Current  
Requirements

Conclusion

- **Program Manager (MSG/PIF):**  
Joe Matis      Joseph.Matis@wpafb.af.mil  
DSN: 674.0353    Comm: 937.904.0353
- **Lead Functional (MSG/PIF):**  
Michael Squires Michael.Squires@wpafb.af.mil  
DSN: 674.0403    Comm: 937.904.0403
- **Alt. Program Manager (MSG/PIF):**  
Christi Ferguson  
Christi.Ferguson@wpafb.af.mil  
DSN: 674.0348    Comm: 937.904.0348



# Integrity@SPS Change Process



Points of  
Contact

**Integrity@SPS**  
**Change Process**

Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"

External  
Requirements

Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role

Current  
Requirements

Conclusion

- **User Submits Change Request On-line**
  - **afcis.ssg.gunter.af.mil**
  - **Forum - Integrity Requirements**
- **Program Manager Review**
  - **Determines Course of Action**
  - **Submits for FRB Evaluation**
- **Program Manager Schedules Changes**
  - **Emergency - Released as Required**
  - **Routine - Quarterly Release Schedule**
- **Development Team Codes Changes**
- **MSG/PIF Conducts Internal Testing**
- **AFCIS-Gunter Conducts Acceptance Test**
- **Tested Update Posted to AFCIS Web Site**



# Requirements vs. “Bugs”

Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process

**Requirements  
vs. “Bugs”**

External  
Requirements

Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role

Current  
Requirements

Conclusion

- **Requirement**
  - **Definition**
    - **Change in Functionality**
    - **New Functionality**
  - **Entered and Managed from AFCIS Web Site**
- **Bug**
  - **Definition**
    - **Software Associated Problem (e.g. Cannot Connect to the Database)**
    - **Error in Intended Results (e.g. Showing an Error for No Funding on an Info CLIN)**
  - **Reported Through AFCIS Integrity Support Line (DSN 674.0426, Commercial 937.904.0426)**
  - **Managed Through Discrepancy Tracking Tool**



# External Requirements

Points of  
Contact

Integrity@SPS  
Change Process

Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"

**External  
Requirements**

Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role

Current  
Requirements

Conclusion

- **Definition**
  - **Requirements Coming from Other Than Contracting Organizations (e.g. DFAS)**
  - **Requirements Stated in FAR and DFAR or Other Regulatory and Statutory Guidelines (e.g. DD Form 350 Fiscal Edits)**
- **Normally Provided to Development Activity One to Five Months Prior to Implementation.**
- **Managed Internally Through Software Tracking**
- **Normally Not Open for Discussion**
- **Not Boarded by FRB**



# Functional Review Board (FRB) Role

Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
**Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role**  
Current  
Requirements  
Conclusion

- **Review All New and Amended Functional Requirements**
- **Must Approve all Functional Requirements Before Inclusion in Integrity**
- **Prioritize Requirements for Addition Into Integrity Product**
- **Will Review During Every FRB Meeting**
  - **AFCIS - Wright-Patterson Will Provide Advanced Copy ~ One Week Prior to FRB**
  - **AFCIS - Wright-Patterson Will Comment on Technical Nature of Requirement to FRB**



# Current Requirements

Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- ## Funding vs. Contract Award Amount

Requirement #:	2001-0034
Status:	Requires FRB Action
Date entered:	17 Dec 01
Entered By:	Ray Sween
Requirement:	Would like to see a "yellow" warning message if funding amount for each line item does equal award amount for same line item.
Justification:	Despite the fact that CONOPS document states that funded amounts in L/Is need to be adjusted so that they match awarded amount, we're still seeing erroneous errors on 1057's because buyers/COs are not adjusting.
Technical Comments:	Technically Feasible





# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **Sales Contracts**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0032
<b>Status:</b>	Requires FRB Action
<b>Date entered:</b>	11 Dec 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Christi Ferguson (for Tessie Dunaway)
<b>Requirement:</b>	Create warning message: "These actions are SALES, NAF or Payment method is via purchase card/check and will not be interfaced with DFAS". IF Pay office = "NAF", or "INCOME", or "CRDCHK" THEN Display Warning
<b>Justification:</b>	We have made it clear to buyers and PCO's not to release any contracts/modifications without clearing all the errors in Integrity. What is not clear is that there are times that you will have errors (i.e. Contracts for sales - where we are receiving income not obligating money or NAF where the funds are non appropriated and contracts where payment method is made via a purchase card/check - where in that case we definitely don't want it interfaced to DFAS to make additional payments. These types of contracts Do not need to be interfaced with DFAS because they are not making the payment. IN SPS we have set up payment offices for SALES, NAF, and PURCHASE Card/Check that should be used for these types of contracts.
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	Latest release provides the warning message, but we need FRB approval to investigate all implications of this (e.g. incorrectly assigning INCOME as a pay office for a commodities contract).



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **Local Preferences**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0033
<b>Status:</b>	Requires FRB Action
<b>Date entered:</b>	11 Dec 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Ray Sween
<b>Requirement:</b>	Sites would like to see a local "preferences" area so that they could information that is constant to that base such as the UIC. This will alleviate the buyer from typing in the UIC every time they want to check an award/mod
<b>Justification:</b>	Elimination of duplication of effort.
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	From a technical standpoint, we can do this; however, we have no licensed method (at this time) to save this information between sessions (other than in an ini file). However, with FRB approval, we can investigate developing a way to save this information without violating any PD2 licensing issues. Request FRB evaluation.



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- ## Funding Amount on Reports

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0027
<b>Status:</b>	Requires FRB Action
<b>Date entered:</b>	2 Nov 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Lorrie Wood
<b>Requirement:</b>	Add the funding amount to all Integrity/1057 reports.
<b>Justification:</b>	Confusion exists on some of the reports because the line item amount is the basis for the report instead of the funding amount(which is what is reported on the 1057).
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	While the funded amount does get reported, the original requirement for these reports was to show both the cost and funded amount on the 1057 report and to base the missing feeder report on the cost rather than the funded (obligated) amount. We can change this with FRB approval to always indicate the obligated amount and to always base reports on this amount. Also require FRB guidance on what information they require on these reports as current DFAR guidelines require reporting on certain zero-dollar actions.



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
Current  
Requirements  
Conclusion

- **New File for DFAS**

Requirement #:	2001-0026			
Status:	Requires FRB Action			
Date entered:	1 Nov 01			
Entered By:	Joe Matis (for DFAS)			
Requirement:	Currently, the interface between PD2 and DFAS (the IAPS interface) can fail for certain types of awards. To help alleviate the problems resulting from this failure, DFAS has requested that sites send a file to them that will allow them to reconcile these situations. They would like the file to consist of the following information:			
	FIELD NAME	POSITION	TYPE	WIDTH
	PAYING OFFICE ADSN	1-6	N	6
	CONTRACT NUMBER	7-23	AN	17
	REQUISITION NUMBER	24-37	AN	14
	CLIN/SLIN	38-43	AN	6
	ACRN	44-45	AN	2
	CONTRACTING SITE ID	46-51	AN	6
	COST TYPE INDICATOR	52-54	AN	3
	PROGRESS PAYMENT	55	AN	1
	LINE ITEM FUNDED AMOUNT	56-71	N	16 (PIC 9(12)V9999)
	(Continued on next slide)			



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **New File for DFAS (cont.)**

<b>Requirement (cont.):</b>	<p>A site would run this daily (similar to the DFAS report) and then email the results to DFAS.</p> <p>If possible, Integrity should not only produce the interface, but also email the results to DFAS. Additionally, a site should be able to schedule this task to run automatically based on a task in the Windows task scheduler as well as run it manually from within the Integrity application or by selecting run from the Windows task scheduler.</p>
<b>Justification:</b>	<p>To help reconcile IAPS problems that can occur with certain types of awards created in PD2.</p>
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	<p>The awards that cause these problems are valid awards that cannot interface with the current IAPS system because they do not (cannot) contain necessary information for the interface. These awards would reject from the interface yet they are valid and legal documents. Although this requirement comes from an external source, it may require some additional work by each site's system administrator; therefore, this requires FRB approval. Additionally, this requirement stems from Integrity@SPS Requirement 2001-018. Please refer to this requirement for additional information.</p>



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **Integrity@SPS Error Numbering**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0025
<b>Status:</b>	Requires FRB Action
<b>Date entered:</b>	23 Oct 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Lisa Goldblatt
<b>Requirement:</b>	Add error numbers to Integrity@SPS error messages
<b>Justification:</b>	This makes it much easier for the user to look up error messages in the help documentation or to convey the proper error to the developer when calling in a problem. It also will make it much easier for the developer to pinpoint error messages in code.
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	This change will affect several programs and files within Integrity@SPS. We would like to phase in this change over 2-3 releases. This change requires FRB approval.



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **Validation of PRs and Solicitations**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0019
<b>Status:</b>	Approved - Currently Scheduled for Next Quarterly Release
<b>Date entered:</b>	15 Aug 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Joe Matis (per Request of 4.1e PFX Participants)
<b>Requirement:</b>	Currently, the Integrity Utility validates awards just prior to release. However, at times it makes sense to begin the validation process early in the procurement cycle. Therefore, request adding the capability to perform validations on PRs and Solicitations.
<b>Justification:</b>	During the 4.1e PFX, we discovered many errors that started in the PR procurement phase. By validating the information received on the PR, we may be able to stem the compounding of problems through the various procurement phases. Currently, Integrity will validate a solicitation, but will give an invalid PIIN/SPIIN error. However, PR validation may require more intensive study as some of the required fields for an award do not yet exist in the PR phase.
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	Currently in requirements list for release 1.2b (Note: version numbering may change in future release).



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **Validation of PRs and Solicitations**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0018
<b>Status:</b>	Requires FRB Action
<b>Date entered:</b>	15 Aug 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Joe Matis (per Request of 4.1e PFX Participants)
<b>Requirement:</b>	Add the ability to validate Concessionaire Contracts (Type "S" Awards) to the Integrity Utility.
<b>Justification:</b>	During the PD2 Version 4.1e it was discovered that the Integrity Utility does not accurately evaluate Concessionaire Contracts. These contracts typically do not have a PR nor a MILSTRIP number. Currently, when the user checks the type "S" award, they will get the MILSTRIP and PR errors from Integrity. To eliminate this, we need to change Integrity to skip the MILSTRIP and PR evaluation steps on type "S" awards. This will allow the user to perform a validation on all other required fields without having to inform the Contracting Officer that the award failed the Integrity test.
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	Although type "S" awards will not interface, nor will they be received into the system through an automated system, we still need to have the users perform the Integrity test on all awards. This will keep them in the habit of using Integrity for all awards. This requirement led to the creation of Integrity@SPS Requirement 2001-026. Please see this requirement for additional information.





# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- **FTP 1057 to J001**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2001-0016
<b>Status:</b>	Requires Additional FRB Evaluation
<b>Date entered:</b>	30 Jul 01
<b>Entered By:</b>	Stephen McLaren
<b>Requirement:</b>	Request to have the capability to FTP the 1057 from the integrity to01 directly into the J001 while still allowing the individual to export and check the edits prior to sending.
<b>Justification:</b>	The number of man-hours it takes to manually key in the 1057 to the J001 far exceeds the amount of time it takes to make this one time change to the integrity tool
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	<p>The FRB has decided that additional discussion on this issue is required based upon the following comment from USAFE... "Results must be editable!!</p> <p>We have to balance almost every 1057 report!</p> <p>Request the following change to provided description: '... while still allowing the individual to export and check/BALANCE the edits prior to sending....'"</p> <p>Based on this, we have determined that technically, we can add the ability to edit and save DD Form 1057 reports to meet USAFE's request. However, this will require some additional investigation into the licensing agreement to determine if we can store the completed forms in a Sybase Database or if we need to look at other options. Ideally, we should use the Sybase Server (not the PD<sup>2</sup> database, but a separate one set up for FPDS reports).</p> <p>Request FRB approval to proceed</p>



# Current Requirements (cont.)



Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
**Current  
Requirements**  
Conclusion

- DIG/TIGS Report**

<b>Requirement #:</b>	2000-0033
<b>Status:</b>	Requires FRB Action
<b>Date entered:</b>	4 Oct 00
<b>Entered By:</b>	Marie J. Walton
<b>Requirement:</b>	Provide the capability to extract data on DIG/TIGS.
<b>Justification:</b>	Extracted data will be provided to SAF/AQC. In addition, DFARS 204-670-2. states that a DD350 should be prepared for all actions (including actions less than \$25,000) that are in a designated industry group under the Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program (see FAR Subpart19.9) EXCEPT for Foreign military sales (i.e., When b9=Y); orders or modifications under Federal Schedules (When B13A=6), actions with government agencies (when Bb=Y), actions with non-US business firms (When D1A=L) or when actions where place of performance is other than the US and its outlying areas (when D1A=M). The DCADS edit further states that D1A must = A, B,C,or D to be counted as a DIGS/TIGS. The FY01 DCADS edits on page 31 lists the NAIC codes for B12D that are to be used for FY01 for the DIGS and TIGS (this replaces the SIC codes).
<b>Technical Comments:</b>	<p>More information on format of the report to follow. The format would be a spreadsheet (table) containing the following fields:</p> <p>Buyer, Award PIIN/SPIIN, NAIC, Obligation, Released date</p> <p>A Memorandum for Record was created identifying considerations that need to be made regarding this requirement. This was sent to the originator, Deb Middleton, Michelle Bell, and Cheryl Martin on 1/19/01. On 1/22/01, Michelle forwarded the information on to the FRB to determine if the report was still a requirement. This requirement is on hold pending the FRB decision.</p>



# Conclusion

Points of  
Contact  
Integrity@SPS  
Change Process  
Requirements  
vs. "Bugs"  
External  
Requirements  
Functional  
Review Board  
(FRB) Role  
Current  
Requirements  
**Conclusion**

- **Integrity@SPS Has Established Requirements Process**
- **"Bugs" Handled Differently than New or Amended Requirements**
- **External Requirements May Bypass Approval Process**
- **FRB Plays Key Role in Determining Validity of Integrity@SPS Requirements**
- **FRB Prioritizes New Requirements and AFCIS Inserts Into Specific Product Releases**
- **AFCIS Will Brief Integrity@SPS Requirements at All FRB Meetings**